

EXHIBIT A

1 Aaron Bell
2 Pro Se
3 1724 N Altamont
4 Spokane WA 99207
5 abellrealtor@gmail.com
509-218-6810

FILED

APR 09 2021

FILED

2021 APR -9 A 4:06

TIMOTHY W. FITZGERALD
SPOKANE COUNTY CLERK

TIMOTHY W. FITZGERALD
SPOKANE COUNTY CLERK

FILED

CN: 2120091332

SN: 3

PC: 58

SUPERIOR COURT IN THE STATE
OF WASHINGTON JURISDICTION

APR 09 2021

TIMOTHY W. FITZGERALD
SPOKANE COUNTY CLERK

9 AARON L. BELL,

Case No.: 21-00913-32

10 Plaintiff,

SUMMONS

11 VS.

13 CITY OF SPOKANE

14 J. CHRISTENSEN, D. DUNKIN

15 J. CURTIS, E. KANNBERG, OFFICER
16 PREUNIGER, UNKNOWN
17 SUPERVISORS.

18 Defendant

19 TO: MICHAEL C. ORMSBY CITY ATTORNEY AND
20 NATHANIEL J. ODLE ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY.
21

22 808 W Spokane Falls Blvd

23 Spokane WA 99201

26 TO THE DEFENDANT: A lawsuit has been started against you in the above-
27 entitled court by Aaron Bell, plaintiff. Plaintiff's claim is stated in the written
28 complaint, a copy of which is served upon you with this summons.

SUMMONS - 1

1
2 In order to defend against this lawsuit, you must respond to the complaint by
3 stating your defense in writing, and by serving a copy upon the person signing this
4 summons within 20 days after the service of this summons, excluding the day of
5 service, or a default judgment may be entered against you without notice. A default
6 judgment is one where plaintiff is entitled to what he asks for because you have not
7 responded. If you serve a notice of appearance on the undersigned person, you are
8 entitled to notice before a default judgment
9 may be entered.

10 You may demand that the plaintiff file this lawsuit with the court. If you
11 do so, the demand must be in writing and must be served upon the person signing
12 this summons. Within 14 days after you serve the demand, the
13 plaintiff must file this lawsuit with the court, or the service on you of this summons
14 and complaint will be void.

15 If you wish to seek the advice of an attorney in this matter, you should do
16 so promptly so that your written response, if any, may be served on time.

17
18 This summons is issued pursuant to rule 4 of the Superior Court Civil
19 Rules of the State of Washington.

20 Aaron Bell Plaintiff Pro Se
21 1724 N Altamont St
22 Spokane WA 99207
23 (509)218-6810

24 Court Clerk

25
26 Date.
27
28

1 Aaron Bell
2 Pro Se
3 1724 N Altamont
4 Spokane WA 99207
5 abellrealtor@gmail.com
6 509-218-6810

4/13/2021
8:43am
RECEIVED
APR 13 2021
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
RSP/THA
Urgent
Process
Served

FILED
2021 APR -9 AM 4:07
TIMOTHY SPARKS, CLERK
SPOKANE CITY CLERK

6 SUPERIOR COURT IN THE STATE
7

8 OF WASHINGTON JURISDICTION

9 AARON L. BELL,

Case No.: 21-00913-32

10 Plaintiff,

AMENDED COMPLAINT

11 vs.

13 CITY OF SPOKANE

14 J. CHRISTENSEN, D. DUNKIN

15 J. CURTIS, E. KANNBERG, OFFICER
16 PREUNIGER, UNKNOWN
17 SUPERVISORS.

18 Defendant

19 TO: MICHAEL C. ORMSBY CITY ATTORNEY AND
20 NATHANIEL J. ODLE ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY.
21

22 808 W Spokane Falls Blvd

23 Spokane WA 99201
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE WASHINGTON STATE SUPERIOR COURT

CIVIL DIVISION

**Complaint for Damages under For Use of Excessive Force by
Arresting Officers, Negligence or Gross Negligence, Reckless Indifference,
Failure to Report Injuries, Assault & Battery, and Failure to Provide
Adequate Medical Treatment, Failure to Train or Continue to Train
Employees, Police Brutality, Constitutional Violations of the 4th, 8th, 14th
Amendment of the US Constitution. 1ST Amendment right to free speech.**

Comes now **AARON L. BELL** (*Plaintiff*), by and through PRO SE, and files this, his Complaint against

J. CHRISENSEN, D. DUNKIN, J. CURTIS, SGT PREUNIGER, & E. KANNBERG, AND or UNKNOWN SUPERVISOR(S). (Police Officers)
(hereinafter **Defendant Officers**), and the **City of SPOKANE**, (hereinafter called **City Defendant**), Defendants, and in support hereof, Plaintiff would show unto the Court the following matters and facts:

COMPLAINT

(1) a violation of rights protected by the Constitution or created by federal statute, (2) proximately caused (3) by conduct of a ‘person’ (4) acting under color of state law.” Crumpton v. Gates, 947 F.2d 1418, 1420 (9th Cir. 1991).

1. This is a cause of action for damages for unlawful violation of civil rights under **42 U.S.C.A. § 1983, 42 U.S.C.A 1988, & 42 U.S. Code § 2000aa-6**

Plaintiff pleads that (1) the defendants acting under color of state law (2) deprived plaintiffs of rights secured by the Constitution or Federal Statutes. Plaintiff claims all of his "**Clearly Established Constitutional Rights**".

A. 4th Amendment Right to be secure in his person. (personal security)

B. 14th Amendment Right to Not to be deprived of my Life or Liberty without due process under the law.

C. 8th Amendment Right to free from Cruel and Unusual Punishment.

D. 1st Amendment Right to Free Speech.

The **right of the people to be secure in their persons**, houses, papers, and effects, against **unreasonable** searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the **persons** or things to **be seized**.

The right to Equal protection under the law and the right to due process.

¹⁰ Gibson v. United States, 781 F.2d 1334, 1338 (9th Cir. 1986).

¹⁰ *Ortez v. Wash. Cty., Or.*, 88 F.3d 804, 810 (9th Cir. 1996).

1 Section 1983 provides a cause of action against persons acting under color of
2 state law who have violated rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The Plaintiff
3 claims his 14th Amendment right to Equal Protection under the law.

4
5 Buckley v. City of Redding, 66 F.3d 188, 190 (9th Cir. 1995); Demery v.
6 Kupperman, 735 F.2d 1139, 1146 (9th Cir. 1984).

7
8
9 Section 1983 can provide a cause of action against persons acting
10 under color of state law who have violated rights guaranteed by federal statutes.
11
12 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1982). Section 1983 states that "[e]very person who, under color
13 of [state law], subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen ... to the deprivation
14 of any rights . . . secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party
15 injured."

16
17 Gonzaga Univ. v. Doe, 536 U.S. 273, 279 (2002); Blessing v. Freestone, 520 U.S.
18 329, 340–41 (1997); Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman, 451 U.S. 1, 28
19 (1981); Maine v. Thiboutot, 448 U.S. 1, 4 (1980); Henry A. v. Willden, 678 F.3d
20 991, 1005 (9th Cir. 2012); Cal. State Foster Parent Ass'n v. Wagner, 624 F.3d 974,
21 978–79 (9th Cir. 2010); AlohaCare v. Haw., Dep't of Human Servs., 572 F.3d 740,
22 745 (9th Cir. 2009); Ball v. Rodgers, 492 F.3d 1094, 1103 (9th Cir. 2007); Legal
23 Servs. of N. Cal., Inc. v. Arnett, 114 F.3d 135, 138 (9th Cir. 1997).

1 A person deprives another of a constitutional right, “within the meaning of § 1983,
2 ‘if he does an affirmative act, participates in another’s affirmative act, or omits to
3 perform an act which he is legally required to do that causes the deprivation of
4 which complaint is made.’” Preschooler II v. Clark Cty. Sch. Bd. of Trs., 479 F.3d
5 1175, 1183 (9th Cir. 2007) (quoting Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir.
6 1978)); see also Lacey v. Maricopa Cty., 693 F.3d 896, 915 (9th Cir. 2012) (en
7 banc); Stevenson v. Koskey, 877 F.2d 1435, 1438–39 (9th Cir. 1989); 21 Leer v.
8 Murphy, 844 F.2d 628, 633 (9th Cir. 1988). “The requisite causal connection may
9 be established when an official set-in motion a ‘series of acts by others which the
10 actor knows or reasonably should know would cause their actions to inflict’
11 constitutional harms.”

12 The plaintiff bears the burden of proving that the right allegedly violated was
13 clearly established at the time of the violation; if the plaintiff meets this burden,
14 then the defendant bears the burden of establishing that the defendant reasonably
15 believed the alleged conduct was lawful. See Sorrels v. McKee, 290 F.3d 965, 969
16 (9th Cir. 2002); Trevino v. Gates, 99 F.3d 911, 916–17 (9th Cir. 1996); Browning
17 v. Vernon, 44 F.3d 818, 822 (9th Cir. 1995); Neely v. Feinstein, 50 F.3d 1502,
18 1509 (9th Cir. 1995), overruled in part on other grounds by L.W. v. Grubbs, 92
19 F.3d 894 (9th Cir. 1996).

20 And other issues in this complaint.

1 2. Jurisdiction is invoked under Chapter 4.12 RCW

2

3 4. Venue is proper under Chapter 4.12 RCW

4

5 6. Plaintiff, **AARON L. BELL**, is a citizen of the United States

7 and a resident of SPOKANE, SPOKANE COUNTY, WASHINGTON STATE.

8 Plaintiff claims all rights and privileges granted him.

9

10 12. 5. Defendants,

11

12 13. **CITY OF SPOKANE, J. CHRISTENSEN , D. DUNKIN , J.**

13

14 15. **CURTIS, SGT PREUNIGER, E. KANNBERG & Unknown Supervisor(s)**

15

16 17. *(Officers)* are police officers employed by Defendant, the **City of SPOKANE**, and

17

18 19. its **agents**, was at all times material acting under the scope of employment and

20 21. under color of state law. With exception of actions of complaint that were

22

23 24. unreasonable and violated Plaintiff Rights.

25

26 27. FACTS

28 29. 6. Defendant **City** is a SPOKANE, WASHINGTON municipal

30

31 32. corporation, and is charged with the duty to supervise, manage and control its

1 Police Department and administration to prevent the violation of the civil rights of
2 its citizens.
3
4

5 **7. Medical Staff at Spokane County Jail are Defendant City of**
6 **Spokane's Agents and are paid by them for services. (Legal action may be**
7 **filed at a later date.)**
8
9

10 Municipalities and other local government units ... [are] among those
11 persons to whom § 1983 applies." *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658,
12 690 (1978); see also *Bd. of Cty. Comm'rs v. Brown*, 520 U.S. 397, 403 (1997);
13 *Edgerly v. City & Cty. of San Francisco*, 599 F.3d 946, 960 (9th Cir. 2010);
14 *Waggy v. Spokane Cty. Wash.*, 594 F.3d 707, 713 (9th Cir. 2010); *Fogel v. Collins*,
15 531 F.3d 824, 834 (9th Cir. 2008); *Long v. Cty. of Los Angeles*, 442 F.3d 1178,
16 1185 (9th Cir. 2006); *Cortez v. Cty. of Los Angeles*, 294 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir.
17 2002); *Fairley v. Luman*, 281 F.3d 913, 916 (9th Cir. 2002) (per curiam); *Van Ort*
18
19 *v. Estate of Stanewich*, 92 F.3d 831, 835 (9th Cir. 1996).
20
21

22 Count One
23
24

25 **8. On or about AUGUST 23rd –AUGUST 24TH , at**
26 approximately 12:00AM, Plaintiff was arrested at 22W MAIN, SPOKANE, WA,
27 within the city limits of SPOKANE.
28

1
2
3 9. At the mentioned time and place, Defendant Officers, in full
4 City police uniforms arrested and detained Plaintiff as he was illegally being
5 detained by employees of Zola's Restaurant at 22 W Main St Spokane WA, RCW
6 9A.16.020 (4) Defendant Officers rolled Plaintiff onto his back plaintiff face down
7 and handcuffed him. During seizure and handcuffing procedures officer did
8 unreasonably kneel on Plaintiff back causing air to be expelled from his lungs.
9 (Knocked the breath out of him) Plaintiff was completely exhausted due to prior
10 beating from Zola's employees where he lost conciseness. Plaintiff was restrained
11 by handcuffs and was unable to move arms and hands. Thus, handicapping
12 Plaintiff from completing normal tasks by design of restraints. Defendant officers
13 verbally abused Plaintiff. Plaintiff was ordered to "sit up" This seemed to Plaintiff
14 an unreasonable request as he was handcuffed and laying on his right shoulder and
15 right hip. Plaintiff responded "Really" as he knew his was unable to complete the
16 task. Defendant Officers then picked him up by the arms sat him on the floor and
17 rested his back on a door jam. (see Video Evidence)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

10. Plaintiff was then escorted to a Police Vehicle in front of the
Restaurant at 22 W Main St Spokane Washington 99201.

1 **11.** At all times material, Defendant Officers had a duty under the
2 Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United
3 States to allow Plaintiff to be secure in his person and be free from injury, refrain
4 from the use of excessive force, to refrain from imposing cruel and unusual
5 punishment, brutality, and right to due process while as Plaintiff was fully seized
6 and was fully detained and controlled by Defendants or its agents. At no time
7 during Plaintiff's seizure and detention by Defendant Officers Plaintiff did not pose
8 any threats to Defendant Officers or the public, Plaintiff did not actively resist
9 arrest, nor did Plaintiff attempt to flee. Defendant officers did not report any risks
10 to their safety or others, Defendant Officers did not charge Plaintiff with resisting
11 arrest, Defendant Officers did not report any attempts by Plaintiff to flee or escape
12 custody. At no time did any Prosecuting Attorney file charges for Assaulting an
13 Officer, Resisting Arrest, or attempts to Flee or escape. Plaintiff was unable to
14 enter rear of vehicle per instructions due to his size and being handicapped by
15 restraints. Plaintiff made Defendant Officers aware of his difficulties verbally at
16 every move. Plaintiff has zero experience in entries of small vehicle space with no
17 use of hands and arms. Vehicle seat and barriers obstructed Plaintiff's left foot to
18 fully get in the vehicle between seat and forward barrier and the handcuffs and
19 hands hit hard plastic rear seat while knees were firmly against forward barrier
20 limiting Plaintiff's entry. Plaintiff continued to follow instruction to the best of his
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 ability and offered alternative solutions. Defendant officers gave orders and
2 Plaintiff followed them to the best of his ability while handicapped by restraints
3 with no use of his hand and arms. Vehicle is a Midsized Ford Edge with
4 modifications to the rear seating area that limits entry. No side step or running
5 board is present on this vehicle, appears to be a product liability issue or wrong
6 tools for the application. One Officer on the scene was not wearing a body camera
7 per Policy and Procedure 703.2. (Officer Preuniger) This information would be
8 valuable to all parties involved if he had followed Policy.

12
13
14 12. Notwithstanding that duty, Defendant Officers were then and
15 there guilty of one or more of the following unreasonable acts; deprivations of
16 clearly established constitutional rights, negligence and/or gross negligence, or
17 willful and wanton misconduct, reckless indifference to plaintiff's medical needs,
18 battery and /or assault, and/or wrongful acts and/or omissions, failure to intervene
19 or act on Plaintiff's behalf, in that they:
20
21
22
23
24

25 A. Plaintiff was told to back up to the rear seat of the vehicle and move
26 onto the seat. The seat was too high and Plaintiff attempted to use the floor of the
27 vehicle to leverage himself into the vehicle. Plaintiff was instructed to not to
28 continue to use the floor of the vehicle to assist him. Plaintiff complied to the best

1 of his ability. Plaintiff had no use of his hands as they were handcuffed and was
2 unable to physically complete the task as instructed. Them, without warning,
3 Plaintiff was unreasonably and violently jerked Plaintiff from his backside by
4 handcuffs that were firmly secured to both wrists, using Excessive Force, into the
5 vehicle from opposite side of vehicle. This action of excessive force and use of
6 handcuffs caused Plaintiff's Right Clavicle to brake and other diverse injuries to
7 both his right and left shoulders. **Plaintiff made Defendant Officers aware of**
8 **injuries immediately.** Plaintiff stated "why did you do that" "You dislocated my
9 shoulder" "My shoulder is dislocated" and other statements/sounds that would lead
10 Defendant Officer or any reasonable person to believe that Plaintiff was seriously
11 injured. Plaintiff's statements were loud enough for all Defendant Officers to hear.
12 Plaintiff was unable to move and handicapped by restraints. Defendants continued
13 further action against Plaintiff's person even though Plaintiffs cried out. Defendant
14 Officer Knew or Should have known that Plaintiff was seriously injured at that
15 time.

22
23 **B.** At that time, all Defendant Officers should have STOPPED
24 further actions and evaluated Plaintiff alleged injuries. Any reasonable person
25 would come to the aid of a person that stated that "you dislocated my shoulder"
26 screams and cries out. Defendant Officers continued to use excessive force and/or
27
28

1 misconducted themselves, willful or wonton misconducted after Plaintiff stated
2 that his arm was broken or shoulder was dislocated knowing or should have known
3 that further action may cause and did cause further damage to Plaintiff's arms and
4 shoulders and caused significant pain and suffering. Defendant Officers brutally
5 unreasonably released seatbelt restraint which slapped Plaintiff in the face and then
6 applied excessive force directly into Plaintiff's broken shoulder further damaging
7 tendons and ligaments and causing extreme pain & additional injuries to Plaintiff.
8
9 Seatbelt restraint was fully over extended from the opposite side of vehicle and
10 forced into broken clavicle while Plaintiff was handcuffed, retrained, handicapped,
11 and unable to move. Defendant Officers further unreasonably pushed Plaintiff into
12 vehicle by the legs with Excessive Force which caused seatbelt which applied
13 additional presser on Plaintiff's injuries as he fell onto his back. This caused a
14 significant amount of pain to Plaintiff and Plaintiff hands were restrained and was
15 unable to relive any pressure to his broken Clavicle. Plaintiff Struggled to relive
16 his pain and suffering that Defendant Officer placed upon him but was unable to
17 do so. Seatbelt was unreasonably excessively forced into Plaintiff's Broken
18 Clavicle. Plaintiff cried out loudly. Defendant Officers shut both rear doors to limit
19 Plaintiff's cries of pain and suffering. Video evidence shows officer Dunkin
20 laughing and Officer Christensen in the state of shock after this event took place.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 C. Officer Cutis was then instructed by Sgt Kannburg
2 (supervisor or ranking Officer on the scene) to make him “sit up”. Officer Curtis
3 opened the door and heard Plaintiff’s screams. Officer Curtis removed the seatbelt
4 embedded deeply in Plaintiff’s Right Clavicle. Then Officer Curtis unreasonably
5 grabbed Plaintiff by both shoulders using excessive force attempted to make
6 Plaintiff sit up as ordered. Officer Curtis knew or should have known that this
7 unreasonable action would cause extreme pain and suffering to Plaintiff and did.
8 Defendant Officer must have been aware of Plaintiff’s injuries as Defendant
9 Officer discontinued his actions when he realized what he was doing to Plaintiff.
10 (Further goes to knowing that significant injuries were “known”) He refused to
11 complete Sgt. Kannburg’s unreasonable order to make Plaintiff sit up. This action
12 further injuries to Plaintiff’s bones, ligaments, tendons. All the time the plaintiff
13 complained and cried out. Plaintiff remained handcuffed, retrained, and was unable
14 to move. Plaintiff’s head was clearly hanging outside of the vehicle when
15 Defendant Officer shut the door. This pushed plaintiff head and neck further into
16 his injured shoulders. Officer Kannburg can be seen in viedo eveidance asking
17 other officer if they had a medical card. (further evidence that he believed that
18 Plaintiff was injured) Plaintiff was attempting to find any leverage he could to get
19 weight off of his injured shoulder but was unsuccessful. He eventually was able
20 place his feet on the roof of the vehicle to push half of upper body off of the seat
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 and away from the door placing his head near the floor of the vehicle. Plaintiff
2 continued to keep his feet on the roof of the vehicle to stabilize riding in the rear of
3 the vehicle as he was sliding and bouncing around the rear at every corner. Officer
4 Kannberg made the decision to take Plaintiff to Spokane County Detention Center
5 rather than a Hospital. It is unclear if Officer Kannberg notified his supervisor prior
6 to this decision.

9
10 D. All defendant officers failed report any injuries to supervisors, failed
11 to properly list any significant injuries or suspected injuries in police reports.

12 (Omission) Failed to report injuries to Supervisors, Internal Affairs, or meet any
13 requirements of Spokane Police Department Police Manual Section 300.

14 Defendants failed to properly report injuries to **any** person or government agency.

15 All Defendant Officers at the scene failed to intervene or actually ordered
16 subordinate officer to inflict pain and suffering. Some defendants failed to write
17 reports. (Omission) Officers failed to follow-up with medical staff to Plaintiff's

18 disposition of injuries. (Deliberate Indifference) Spokane Police Manual section
19 300 Use of Force. 300.5.1, Notifications to Supervisors, 300.2.1 Duty to

20 Intercede/Ethical Intervention. 300.6 Medical Consideration. 300.5 Documenting
21 Use of Force. Cannon One, 100.4 Constitutional Requirement. These and other
22 Constitutional violations.

1
2 **E.** Plaintiff further states a claim against Supervising Defendant
3 Officer(s) that were on scene for deliberate indifference based upon the
4 supervisor's direct knowledge of Plaintiff injuries and personally participation by
5 directing subordinate Defendant Officers in unconstitutional conduct by his
6 subordinates.
7
8

9
10 **F.** Defendant Supervisor(s) or (Ranking Officer) on the scene at the time
11 of the event participated in and/or directed subordinate officers in their
12 unreasonable conduct, witnessed constitutional violations, heard plaintiffs'
13 complaints and cries of injuries, failed to intervene or terminate further violations,
14 and were deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff's injuries and need for medical
15 attention, failed to write or file a report of any Misconduct, or Use of Force,
16 plaintiff's serious injuries, or constitutional violations. Defendant Supervisor(s) did
17 order (or continued to ignore/ Directed) subordinate Officer to continue actions
18 knowing that Plaintiff was clearly seriously injured, and in pain, and suffering.
19 Unknown Supervisor(s) or senior supervisor(s) either were not properly informed
20 of the Use of Force by their subordinates or failed to take actions as required if
21 they were informed. Either or both are violations of the Spokane Police Manual
22 2019 sections 300 and violation of the constitution if the United States.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Particularly protections against **unreasonable search and seizure**. These actions
2 were **Unreasonable** and clearly established.
3
4

5 Plaintiff pleads that each Government-official defendant, through the
6 official's own individual actions, has violated the Constitution."); Rodriguez v. Cty.
7 of Los Angeles, 891 F.3d 776, 798 (9th Cir. 2018)
8
9

10
11 "Liability under [§] 1983 arises only upon a showing of personal
12 participation by the defendant. A supervisor is only liable for the constitutional
13 violations of ... subordinates if the supervisor participated in or directed the
14 violations, or knew of the violations and failed to act to prevent them. There is no
15 respondent superior liability under [§] 1983." Taylor v. List, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045
16 (9th Cir. 1989) (citations omitted); see also Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 676
17
18 (2009)

19
20
21 (1) His personal involvement in the constitutional deprivation, or (2) a sufficient
22 causal connection between the supervisor's wrongful conduct and the
23 constitutional violation.; King v. Cty. of Los Angeles, 885 F.3d 548, 559 (9th Cir.
24
25 2018) (same); Keates v. Koile, 883 F.3d 1228, 1242–43 (9th Cir. 2018) "The
26 requisite causal connection can be established ... by setting in motion a series of
27
28

1 acts by others or by knowingly refus[ing] to terminate a series of acts by others,
2 which [the supervisor] knew or reasonably should have known would cause others
3 to inflict a constitutional injury.”” Rodriguez, 891 F.3d at 798 (quoting 22 Starr v.
4 Baca, 652 F.3d 1202, 1207 (9th Cir. 2011); see also King, 885 F.3d at 559.
5 (concluding that failure to intervene to stop alleged violation could be sufficient to
6 establish liability); Redman v. Cty. of San Diego, 942 F.2d 1435, 1446–47 (9th Cir.
7 1991)

11

12 “A showing that a supervisor acted, or failed to act, in a manner that
13 was deliberately indifferent to an inmate’s is sufficient to demonstrate the
14 involvement – and the liability – of that supervisor. Thus, when a supervisor is
15 found liable based on deliberate indifference, the supervisor is being held liable for
16 his or her own culpable action or inaction, not held vicariously liable for the
17 culpable action or inaction of his or her subordinates.” Starr v. Baca, 652 F.3d
18 1202, 1207 (9th Cir. 2011) (holding that “a plaintiff may state a claim against a
19 supervisor for deliberate indifference based upon the supervisor’s knowledge of
20 and acquiescence in unconstitutional conduct by his or her subordinates”).

21 Plaintiff was in fact “a prisoner” Plaintiff followed instructions of
22 Defendants to the best of his ability. Plaintiff verbally expressed when he was
23

1 unable to meet commands. Plaintiff was handicapped and unable to use his hands
2 and arms as they were in restraints.
3
4

5 **G.** Defendants unreasonably willfully and wantonly recklessly
6 with negligence or gross negligence used excessive force. Defendant Officers
7 misconduct(s) directly resulted Plaintiff injuries.
8
9

10 **13.** After wrongfully battering Plaintiff and causing him to sustain
11 severe pain and suffering and severe and permanently severely injury, Defendant
12 Officers wrongfully failed to assure that Plaintiff received adequate medical
13 treatment, and instead brought Plaintiff to Spokane County Detention Center,
14 where Plaintiff was evaluated by staff who looked at the injured area and stated
15 there was nothing wrong despite continued complaints from Plaintiff that his
16 arm/shoulder was broken. Medical Staff then wrote report that Plaintiff stated his
17 shoulder was broken and failed to treat injuries or refer to personal that could.
18

19 Medical Staff RN Plaintiff states “I broke my shoulder” (False Statement) (1)
20 Defendant Officers failed to follow up with medical personal as to Plaintiff’s
21 medical condition. (2) Medical Personal and or Supervisors at the Spokane County
22 Detention Center Failed to Report Plaintiffs significant injuries to any governing
23 bodies of the Spokane Police Department, Defendant Officers Supervisors, or
24
25
26
27
28

1 Defendant Officers that delivered him there. If any one of these 2 events took
2 place a Supervisor or Defendant Officers should have had to take action under
3
4 Section 300 Use of Force. SPD Policy and Procedure Manual. **Significant**
5 **Injuries** were reported by Physician Travis Dirks (MD)to Spokane County
6 Detention Center at 8:29AM 8/24/2019 via fax from Providence Health Care. How
7
8 this **important information** was distributed or if it was is unknown. (Discovery
9 issues)

11
12 The government has an “obligation to provide medical care for those
13 whom it is **punishing by incarceration**,” and failure to meet that obligation can
14 constitute an Eighth Amendment violation cognizable under § 1983. Estelle v.
15 Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 103–05, 97 S. Ct. 285, 50 L. Ed. 2d 251 (1976)
16
17

18
19 **14.** Plaintiff remained in the Spokane County Detention Center for
20 approximately 3-4 hours while constantly asking for an attorney, constantly
21 complaining that his arm was broken, and needed medical attention. Medical Staff
22 Knew or Should have known that these actions could have caused plaintiff
23 additional injuries. Extent of Plaintiff’s injuries were unknow to Medical Staff and
24 Plaintiff at that time. Plaintiff was then taken to hospital where an actual **Medical**
25 **Doctor** confirmed Plaintiff’s Claim. Plaintiff’s shoulder was broken. (Right
26
27
28 AMENDED COMPLAINT - 19

1 Clavicle) Plaintiff's family posted bail at approximately 1-2AM on Aug 24th after
2 they could not locate him. Defendant's Agent(s) paid the bill for the hospital
3
4 emergence visit. (Spokane County Detention Center) Spokane County Detention
5 Center did not have a physician on staff at that time and does not have the tools to
6 diagnosis a broken shoulder or arm. Plaintiff claim on its face was ignored.
7

8 **Plaintiff was “in fact” significantly injured.**

9
10
11 Delay of, or interference with, medical treatment can also amount to
12 deliberate indifference. See Jett, 439 F.3d at 1096; Clement, 298 F.3d at 905;
13 Hallett, 296 F.3d at 744; Lopez, 203 F.3d at 1131; Jackson, 90 F.3d at 332;
14 McGuckin, 974 F.2d at 1059; Hutchinson v. United States, 838 F.2d 390, 394 (9th
15 Cir. 1988).

16
17
18
19 “[D]eliberate indifference to a prisoner’s serious illness or injury
20 states a cause of action under § 1983.”); Jett v. Penner, 439 F.3d 1091, 1096 (9th
21 Cir. 2006); Toguchi v. Chung, 391 F.3d 1051, 1057 (9th Cir. 2004); Clement v.
22 Gomez, 298 F.3d 898, 904 (9th Cir. 2002); Hallett v. Morgan, 296 F.3d 732, 744
23 (9th Cir. 2002); Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1131 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc);
24 Johnson v. Meltzer, 134 F.3d 1393, 1398 (9th Cir. 1998); Kelley v. Borg, 60 F.3d
25 664, 667 (9th Cir. 1995); Anderson v. Cty. of Kern, 45 F.3d 1310, 1316 (9th Cir.
26
27
28

1 1995); McGuckin v. Smith, 974 F.2d 1050, 1059 (9th Cir. 1992), overruled on
2 other grounds by WMX Techs., Inc. v. Miller, 104 F.3d 1133 (9th Cir. 1997
3
4

5 **15.** The unreasonable failure of Defendant Officers or Defendant's
6 Agents to assure that Plaintiff received adequate medical evaluation and treatment
7 prior to being placed in a detention cell was in violation of Plaintiff's rights under
8 the Fourth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United
9 States to be secured in his person, free from the excessive use of force, and to be
10 free from reckless indifference to his serious medical needs and further violated the
11 eighth amendment for cruel and unusual punishment and Plaintiff's right to be
12 secure in his person.
13
14

15
16
17 **"A 'serious' medical need exists if the failure to treat a prisoner's**
18 **condition could result in further significant injury or the 'unnecessary and**
19 **wanton infliction of pain.'" McGuckin, 974 F.2d at 1059 (quoting Estelle, 429
20 U.S. at 104); see also Jett, 439 F.3d at 1096; Clement, 298 F.3d at 904; Doty v. Cty.
21 of Lassen, 37 F.3d 540, 546 (9th Cir. 1994).
22
23
24**

25
26 **16.** As a direct and proximate result of one or more of the said
27 unreasonable wrongful acts or omissions to act of Defendant Officers and or its
28 AMENDED COMPLAINT - 21

1 agents, Plaintiff suffered significant and severe permanent injury to his person,
2 pain, suffering, disability, loss of income, mental anguish, humiliation, and other
3 diverse injuries.
4
5
6

7 17. Defendant City failed to adequately train Defendant Officers in
8 proper arrest and detention procedures, reporting procedures, and how to handle
9 persons who have significant injuries that are in their custody as to ensure that
10 Defendant Officers did not violate the rights of a citizen clearly established Federal
11 and State Constitutional Rights. Failed to adequately supervise Defendant Officers
12 in order to ensure that Defendant Officers did not violate the rights of a citizen to
13 be receive adequate medical attention when needed. Failure to train. There appears
14 to be two supervisors at the scene that failed in their duties and obligations to
15 Plaintiff. Unknown senior supervisors were either not informed or were derelict in
16 their official duties if they were informed. **There are Supervisors that remain**
17 **unknown.**
18
19

20 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants,
21 and each of them, for their wrongful violations of Plaintiff's right to be free from
22 the excessive use of force under the Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments
23 to the Constitution of the United States, in the amount of \$250,000 as and for
24
25
26
27
28

1 compensatory damages, punitive damages in an amount sufficient to deter such
2 wrongful conduct in the future, plus attorney fees and costs, as provided in 42
3 U.S.C.A. § 1988. Plaintiff demands trial by jury.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

11 COUNT TWO
12
13

14 **RECKLESS INDIFFERENCE TO PLAINTIFF'S SERIOUS MEDICAL
15 NEEDS**

16 Plaintiff here re-alleges the allegations of Paragraphs 1-17 of Count One as
17 the allegations of this Count Two, as if fully set forth.
18
19

20 Physicians who contract with prisons to provide medical services are
21 acting under color of state law. See *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 53–54 (1988);
22 *Lopez v. Dep't of Health Servs.*, 939 F.2d 881, 883 (9th Cir. 1991) (per curiam)
23 (hospital and ambulance service under contract with the state). Cf. *Flore v.*
24 *Congregation Pidyon Shevuyim, N.A.*, 639 F.3d 916, 925–26 (9th Cir. 2011)
25 (distinguishing *West* and determining that contract chaplains were not state actors).
26
27
28

18. When Plaintiff arrived at the Spokane County Detention Center the Police Vehicle door was opened by Deputy Sheriffs. Plaintiff immediately stated that his arm was broken and asked them to please not touch him. He also asked that they allow him to attempt to exit the vehicle on his own. They complied. Plaintiff painfully exited the vehicle. Any one of these persons knew or should have known that plaintiff was in extreme pain and distressed. Plaintiff was handcuffed and had no use of his arms and hands plaintiff exited the vehicle in great pain.

19. Medical Personal (Jessica Goodeill RN) at Spokane County Detention Center (City Defendants Agent) attempted to interrogate Plaintiff during examination of his medical condition and did make false statements. Medical Personal continued to make false statements that Plaintiff broke his own Shoulder. Plaintiff corrected her. Plaintiff was in the state of "The state of Shock, in Pain, and Under Extreme Duress" as his arm was broken by Defendant officers approximately 15/20 min prior to his arrival. Plaintiff had also lost conciseness prior to police contact and suffered a concussion from previous assault. Plaintiff **had not forgotten** how his injuries occurred at time of examination by medical staff. Plaintiff did not see Officer that broke his arm as he was to his rear. Some Defendant Officers where present during the examination. When Plaintiff invoked

1 his Miranda Rights and asked for an attorney, he was labeled uncooperative and
2 belligerent for not agreeing with medical personal as to how he was injured. This
3 did not stop Medical personal from making false claims and reporting that Plaintiff
4 stated that he broke his own shoulder. Plaintiff was unreasonably **immediately**
5 **punished** and placed into a jail cell without further medical examination for asking
6 for an attorney. (Delayed) Plaintiff was clearly in pain and also verbally expressed
7 this this to medical personal. The Registered Nurse did examine Plaintiff's
8 shoulder. She states in her report "I broke my shoulder" No further information
9 given. Belligerent and Uncoop. This document is not signed, dated, nor is there a
10 time referenced. Medical person was able to take Plaintiff's temperature,
11 respiration and blood pressure as indicated in the unsigned intake document. As a
12 person begging for Medical treatment throughout the prior events, why would
13 Plaintiff be Belligerent? She was obviously aware that Plaintiffs shoulder was
14 seriously injured or broken. (Belligerent is a subjective term) Plaintiff was clearly
15 in pain and suffering. Plaintiff couldn't have needed an attorney more than during
16 these events. Plaintiff was not allowed to contact an attorney. Plaintiff was
17 punished for asking for an attorney. Medical staff simply refused Plaintiff medical
18 attention because he would not agree to how his shoulder was broken. To the best
19 of Plaintiffs knowledge, there is not radiology equipment or physician at the
20 Spokane County Detention Center at that time. RN would be unable to diagnose
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 injuries if she believed or did not believe her own written false statement. Plaintiff
2 should have been referred to Hospital at that time. No further information would
3 have been required. Plaintiff stated that his arm was broken. How injuries occurred
4 is irrelevant. Medical staff member is not a medical doctor (MD) Fact: Medical
5 Staff at the Spokane County Detention Center is unable to diagnosis Plaintiff's
6 specific complaint was in needs of medical treatment. Plaintiff should have been
7 referred to hospital immediately. To the best of plaintiff knowledge Jessica
8 Goodeill does not have the power or authority to arrest or apply discipline to
9 detainees (More discovery issue here)

10
11
12
13
14
15 20. Plaintiff was then placed in a jail cell for approximately 4 hours
16 for invoking his Miranda Rights and asking for an attorney. Plaintiff cried out that
17 he wanted an attorney and was in need of medical treatment many times while
18 incarcerated. (**being punished**) When jail cell was opened 5 Deputy Sheriffs
19 entered in further attempts to create duress and coerce Plaintiff further. Plaintiff
20 was in fear for his safety after earlier battery and unable to move his right arm.
21 Plaintiff thought that he was going to be assaulted further for asking for medical
22 attention for his broken arm and an attorney. Medical Personal entered and
23 examined Plaintiff without any questions and stated Plaintiff was to be taken to
24
25
26
27
28

1 Hospital for further examination. (Different person did the examination at that
2 time) Amanda Spayde RN
3
4

5 **21.** When Plaintiff was asked how his arm was broken by Physician he
6 was only allowed to tell part of the story. Plaintiff was never allowed to contact an
7 attorney as requested. At all times Spokane County Jail Medical Personal and
8 Physician were acting under the color of law and as Defendant Cities Agent.
9
10 Interrogation and coercion by Medical Professionals are reprehensible and should
11 never be tolerated or allowed. Plaintiff partially finished telling his story of how
12 his arm was broken when he was commanded to “shut up” by Deputy Sheriff that
13 had custody of him. Plaintiff attempted to finish his story and was told to “shut up”
14 again being spit on by Deputy Sheriff while he loudly and aggressively
15 commanded approximately 2 inches from Plaintiff’s face. Plaintiff requested an
16 attorney. The part of the story was at the point where Defendant Officer had
17 broken my shoulder by jerking Plaintiff by the handcuffs thus breaking his
18 shoulder. Physician and Deputy Sheriff left the room per physician request to
19 discuss status. The bill for medical services was paid by Spokane County
20 Detention Center thus making this person an agent of the City Defendant hired to
21 do medical treatment of prisoners of the City of Spokane Police Department.
22
23 Result of examination was Plaintiff’s Right Clavicle was fractured. (Broken)
24
25
26
27
28

1 Other diverse injuries would be exposed at later dated examinations by Orthopedic
2 Surgeons **not in the employed or affiliated with Defendants.** How Plaintiff's
3 injuries occurred is irrelevant to a medical prognosis.
4
5
6

7 First Amendment right to free speech.
8

9 Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 - Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law
10

11 **Coercion RCW 9A.36.070**
12

13 Invoking Mariana Rights.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22. If the individual indicates in any manner, at any time prior to or
23 during questioning, that he or she wishes to remain silent the interrogation must
24 cease. If the individual states that he or she wants an attorney, the interrogation
25 must cease until an attorney is present. At that time, the individual must have an
26 opportunity to confer with the attorney and to have him or her present during any
27 subsequent questioning.
28

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
55310
55311
55312
55313
55314
55315
55316
55317
55318
55319
55320
55321
55322
55323
55324
55325
55326
55327
55328
55329
55330
55331
55332
55333
55334
55335
55336
55337
55338
55339
55340
55341
55342
55343
55344
55345
55346
55347
55348
55349
55350
55351
55352
55353
55354
55355
55356
55357
55358
55359
55360
55361
55362
55363
55364
55365
55366
55367
55368
55369
55370
55371
55372
55373
55374
55375
55376
55377
55378
55379
55380
55381
55382
55383
55384
55385
55386
55387
55388
55389
55390
55391
55392
55393
55394
55395
55396
55397
55398
55399
553100
553101
553102
553103
553104
553105
553106
553107
553108
553109
553110
553111
553112
553113
553114
553115
553116
553117
553118
553119
553120
553121
553122
553123
553124
553125
553126
553127
553128
553129
553130
553131
553132
553133
553134
553135
553136
553137
553138
553139
553140
553141
553142
553143
553144
553145
553146
553147
553148
553149
553150
553151
553152
553153
553154
553155
553156
553157
553158
553159
553160
553161
553162
553163
553164
553165
553166
553167
553168
553169
553170
553171
553172
553173
553174
553175
553176
553177
553178
553179
553180
553181
553182
553183
553184
553185
553186
553187
553188
553189
553190
553191
553192
553193
553194
553195
553196
553197
553198
553199
553200
553201
553202
553203
553204
553205
553206
553207
553208
553209
553210
553211
553212
553213
553214
553215
553216
553217
553218
553219
553220
553221
553222
553223
553224
553225
553226
553227
553228
553229
553230
553231
553232
553233
553234
553235
553236
553237
553238
553239
553240
553241
553242
553243
553244
553245
553246
553247
553248
553249
553250
553251
553252
553253
553254
553255
553256
553257
553258
553259
553260
553261
553262
553263
553264
553265
553266
553267
553268
553269
553270
553271
553272
553273
553274
553275
553276
553277
553278
553279
553280
553281
553282
553283
553284
553285
553286
553287
553288
553289
553290
553291
553292
553293
553294
553295
553296
553297
553298
553299
553300
553301
553302
553303
553304
553305
553306
553307
553308
553309
553310
553311
553312
553313
553314
553315
553316
553317
553318
553319
553320
553321
553322
553323
553324
553325
553326
553327
553328
553329
553330
553331
553332
553333
553334
553335
553336
553337
553338
553339
553340
553341
553342
553343
553344
553345
553346
553347
553348
553349
553350
553351
553352
553353
553354
553355
553356
553357
553358
553359
553360
553361
553362
553363
553364
553365
553366
553367
553368
553369
553370
553371
553372
553373
553374
553375
553376
553377
553378
553379
553380
553381
553382
553383
553384
553385
553386
553387
553388
553389
553390
553391
553392
553393
553394
553395
553396
553397
553398
553399
553400
553401
553402
553403
553404
553405
553406
553407
553408
553409
553410
553411
553412
553413
553414
553415
553416
553417
553418
553419
553420
553421
553422
553423
553424
553425
553426
553427
553428
553429
553430
553431
553432
553433
553434
553435
553436
553437
553438
553439
553440
553441
553442
553443
553444
553445
553446
553447
553448
553449
553450
553451
553452
553453
553454
553455
553456
553457
553458
553459
553460
553461
553462
553463
553464
553465
553466
553467
553468
553469
553470
553471
553472
553473
553474
553475
553476
553477
553478
553479
553480
553481
553482
553483
553484
553485
553486
553487
553488
553489
553490
553491
553492
553493
553494
553495
553496
553497
553498
553499
553500
553501
553502
553503
553504
553505
553506
553507
553508
553509
553510
553511
553512
553513
553514
553515
553516
553517
553518
553519
553520
553521
553522
553523
553524
553525
553526
553527
553528
553529
553530
553531
553532
553533
553534
553535
553536
553537
553538
553539
553540
553541
553542
553543
553544
553545
553546
553547
553548
553549
553550
553551
553552
553553
553554
553555
553556
553557
553558
553559
553560
553561
553562
553563
553564
553565
553566
553567
553568
553569
553570
553571
553572
553573
553574
553575
553576
553577
553578
553579
553580
553581
553582
553583
553584
553585
553586
553587
553588
553589
553590
553591
553592
553593
553594
553595
553596
553597
553598
553599
553600
553601
553602
553603
553604
553605
553606
553607
553608
553609
553610
553611
553612
553613
553614
553615
553616
553617
553618
553619
553620
553621
553622
553623
553624
553625
553626
553627
553628
553629
553630
553631
553632
553633
553634
553635
553636
553637
553638
553639
553640
553641
553642
553643
553644
553645
553646
553647
553648
553649
553650
553651
553652
553653
553654
553655
553656
553657
553658
553659
553660
553661
553662
553663
553664
553665
553666
553667
553668
553669
553670
553671
553672
553673
553674
553675
553676
553677
553678
553679
553680
553681
553682
553683
553684
553685
553686
553687
553688
553689
553690
553691
553692
553693
553694
553695
553696
553697
553698
553699
553700
553701
553702
553703
553704
553705
553706
553707
553708
553709
553710
553711
553712
553713
553714
553715
553716
553717
553718
553719
553720
553721
553722
553723
553724
553725
553726
553727
553728
553729
553730
553731
553732
553733
553734
553735
553736
553737
553738
553739
5537340
5537341
5537342
5537343
5537344
5537345
5537346
5537347
5537348
5537349
5537350
5537351
5537352
5537353
5537354
5537355
5537356
5537357
5537358
5537359
5537360
5537361
5537362
5537363
5537364
5537365
5537366
5537367
5537368
5537369
5537370
5537371
5537372
5537373
5537374
5537375
5537376
5537377
5537378
5537379
5537380
5537381
5537382
5537383
5537384
5537385
5537386
5537387
5537388
5537389
5537390
5537391
5537392
5537393
5537394
5537395
5537396
5537397
5537398
5537399
5537400
5537401
5537402
5537403
5537404
5537405
5537406
5537407
5537408
5537409
5537410
5537411
5537412
5537413
5537414
5537415
5537416
5537417
5537418
5537419
55374100
55374101
55374102
55374103
55374104
55374105
55374106
55374107
55374108
55374109
55374110
55374111
55374112
55374113
55374114
55374115
55374116
55374117
55374118
55374119
553741100
553741101
553741102
553741103
553741104
553741105
553741106
553741107
553741108
553741109
553741110
553741111
553741112
553741113
553741114
553741115
553741116
553741117
553741118
553741119
5537411100
5537411101
5537411102
5537411103
5537411104
5537411105
5537411106
5537411107
5537411108
5537411109
5537411110
5537411111
5537411112
5537411113
5537411114
5537411115
5537411116
5537411117
5537411118
5537411119
55374111100
55374111101
55374111102
55374111103
55374111104
55374111105
55374111106
55374111107
55374111108
55374111109
55374111110
55374111111
55374111112
55374111113
55374111114
55374111115
55374111116
55374111117
55374111118
55374111119
553741111100
553741111101
553741111102
553741111103
553741111104
553741111105
553741111106
553741111107
553741111108
553741111109
553741111110
553741111111
553741111112
553741111113
553741111114
553741111115
553741111116
553741111117
553741111118
553741111119
5537411111100
5537411111101
5537411111102
5537411111103
5537411111104
5537411111105
5537411111106
5537411111107
5537411111108
5537411111109
5537411111110
5537411111111
5537411111112
5537411111113
5537411111114
5537411111115
5537411111116
5537411111117
5537411111118
5537411111119
55374111111100
55374111111101
55374111111102
55374111111103
55374111111104
5

1 response was the videos were deleted. Request for records on 9-3-2019 and second
2 request on 12-19-2019.
3
4

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants,
6 and each of them, for their violation of Plaintiff's rights under the Fourth and
7 Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the amount of
8 \$250,000 as and for compensatory damages, punitive damages in an amount
9 sufficient to deter such wrongful conduct in the future, plus Plaintiff's attorney fees
10 and costs as provided in 42 U.S.C.A. § 1988. Plaintiff demands trial by jury.
11
12

13
14
15
16 COUNT THREE
17

18 **MONETARY CLAIM AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY**
19
20

21 Plaintiff here re-alleges the allegations of Paragraphs 1-23 of
22 Count One as the allegations of this Count Three, as if fully set forth.
23
24

25 **24.** Defendant City is a WASHINGTON STATE municipal
26 corporation which operates, administers, maintains and controls the Spokane
27 Police Department as one of its executive branches.
28

1
2 **25.** Defendant City has established policies and procedures for its
3 Police Department regarding the use of force, reporting injuries to supervisor, and
4 the need to not violate person Clearly Established Constitutional Rights in Spokane
5 Police Policy Manuals 2019. The Defendant City has produced Policies and
6 Procedure for themselves as well. May or May not have Policies and Procedures
7 set for its agents. (discovery issues)

8
9
10
11
12 **26.** In establishing these procedures, Defendant City had a duty
13 under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United
14 States to refrain from enforcing continuing in effect policies and procedures
15 and/or “Customs” , or lack of, that created a substantial likelihood that Persons
16 would be subjected to the use of excessive force by City’s Police Department
17 officers, or policies and procedures or Customs which created a substantial
18 likelihood that the serious medical needs of prisoners or detainees would not be
19 treated with reckless indifference by its agents, servants and employees employed
20 by City’s Police Department. Or further by ignoring Policy and Procedures
21 themselves. Failure to train or enforce these Policies and Procedures has resulted in
22 violations of Plaintiffs Clearly Established Constitutional Rights. All defendants
23 had a duty and a responsibility to follow these Clearly Established Policies and
24
25
26
27
28

1 Procedures and not violate Constitutional Laws and rights of individuals they come
2 in contact with.
3
4

5 **27.** Notwithstanding its mentioned duties, Defendant City and its
6 Officers and City Attorney's Office were guilty of one or more of the following
7 wrongful acts or omissions to act in violation of the Plaintiff's Constitutional rights
8 and Policy and Procedures that may have initiated complaints, in that it:
9
10

11
12 A. Allowed policies and procedures to continue in force and effect which
13 resulted in the use of excessive force against Plaintiff, and Violations
14 of Plaintiff's constitutional rights. **Failure to enforce** said Policies
15 and Procedures. Failure to train Employes and Agents on Federal,
16 State laws, and Constitutional Laws, and Policies and Procedures.
17
18

19
20 “A county is subject to Section 1983 liability ‘if its policies, whether
21 set by the government’s lawmakers or by those whose edicts or acts ... **may fairly**
22 **be said to represent official policy**, caused the particular constitutional violation
23 at issue.’” King v. Cty. of Los Angeles, 885 F.3d 548, 558 (9th Cir. 2018) (quoting
24 Streit v. County of Los Angeles, 236 F.3d 552, 559 (9th Cir. 2001)); Rivera v. Cty.
25 of Los Angeles, 745 F.3d 384, 389 (9th Cir. 2014) (“[M]unicipalities, including
26
27
28

1 counties and their sheriff's departments, can only be liable under § 1983 if an
2 unconstitutional action 'implements or executes a policy statement, ordinance,
3 regulation, or decision officially adopted and promulgated by that body's officers.'"
4 (quoting *Monell*, 436 U.S. at 690)).
5
6
7

8 **B.** Had a custom and practice of failing to independently and adequately
9 investigate complaints of excessive force and failure to train Municipal Employees
10 adequately. Had a custom of not following their own requirements. Not ensuring
11 that the Policies and Procedure that they impose on the Spokane Police department
12 are properly enforced.
13
14

15
16 The plaintiff may also establish municipal liability by demonstrating
17 that the alleged constitutional violation was caused by a failure to train municipal
18 employees adequately. See *City of Canton, Ohio v. Harris*, 489 U.S. 378, 388–91
19 (1989); *Garmon v. Cty. of Los Angeles*, 828 F.3d 837, 846 (9th Cir. 2016); *Flores*
20 v. Cty. of Los Angeles, 758 F.3d 1154, 1158 (9th Cir. 2014); *Price v. Sery*, 513
21 F.3d 962, 973 (9th Cir. 2008); *Blankenhorn v. City of Orange*, 485 F.3d 463, 484–
22 85 (9th Cir. 2007); *Long v. Cty. of Los Angeles*, 442 F.3d 1178, 1186–87 (9th Cir.
23 2006); *Johnson v. Hawe*, 388 F.3d 676, 686 (9th Cir. 2004); *Miranda v. Clark Cty.*,
24 Nev., 319 F.3d 465, 471 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc); *Fairley v. Luman*, 281 F.3d 913,
25
26
27
28

1 917 (9th Cir. 2002) (per curiam); see especially Bd. of Cty. Comm’rs v. Brown,
2 520 U.S. 397, 409–10 (1997) (discussing limited scope of such a claim). Such a
3 showing depends on three elements: (1) the training program must be inadequate
4 “in relation to the tasks the particular officers must perform”; (2) the city officials
5 must have been deliberately indifferent “to the rights of persons with whom the
6 [local officials] come into contact”; and (3) the inadequacy of the training “must
7 be shown to have ‘actually caused’ the constitutional deprivation at issue.” Merritt
8 v. Cty. of Los Angeles, 875 F.2d 765, 770 (9th Cir. 1989) (internal citations
9 omitted); see also Connick v. Thompson, 563 U.S. 51, 61 (2011) (stating, “To
10 satisfy the statute, a municipality’s failure to train its employees in a relevant
11 respect must amount to ‘deliberate indifference to the rights of persons with whom
12 the [untrained employees] come into contact.’ [] Only then ‘can such a
13 shortcoming be properly thought of as a city ‘policy or custom’ that is actionable
14 under § 1983.’”) (quoting City of Canton, 489 U.S. at 388). Note that “[a]
15 municipality’s culpability for a deprivation of rights is at its most tenuous where a
16 claim turns on a failure to train.” Connick, 563 U.S. at 61.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 C. Had a custom and practice of failing to effectively discipline,
26 train or retrain Police Officers that wrongfully utilized excessive force and failure
27 to follow Policies and Procedures. Leaving opportunities for Police Officers to

1 **circumvent** Policies and Procedures to evade reporting violations of Use of Force
2 that resulted in injuries in order to **protect themselves**.
3
4

5 **D.** Failed to establish appropriate policies and procedures to
6 address and correct the repeated use or misuse of excessive force by police officers,
7
8 constitutional violation in arrests and **use of handcuffs**.
9
10

11 Prior to Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), and
12 Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009), this court held that “a claim of municipal
13 liability under [§] 1983 is sufficient to withstand a motion to dismiss ‘even if the
14 claim is based on nothing more than a bare allegation that the individual officers’
15 conduct conformed to official policy, custom, or practice.’” Karim-Panahi v. L.A.
16 Police Dep’t., 839 F.2d 621, 624 (9th Cir. 1988) (quoting Shah v. Cty. of Los
17 Angeles, 797 F.2d 743, 747 (9th Cir. 1986)); see also Evans, 869 F.2d at 1349;
18 Shaw v. Cal. Dep’t of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 788 F.2d 600, 610 (9th Cir.
19 1986) (“[I]t is enough if the custom or policy can be inferred from the
20 allegations of the complaint.”).
21
22

23 **E.** Allowed the continuance in force and effect of policies and
24 procedures which failed to protect detainees who had sustained injury from the
25
26
27
28

reckless indifference of Defendant City's agents, servants and employees in its Police Department to their serious medical needs. Further failed to place policies and procedures for its agents. (Spokane County Detention Center) Municipal Employees are simply allowed to "dump" seriously injured persons there and possibly avoid reporting Use of Force. (Discovery)

First, to be entitled to the presumption of truth, allegations in a complaint or counterclaim may not simply recite the elements of a cause of action, but must contain sufficient allegations of underlying facts to give fair notice and to enable the opposing party to defend itself effectively. Second, the factual allegations that are taken as true must plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief, such that it is not unfair to require the opposing party to be subjected to the expense of discovery and continued litigation. *Starr v. Baca*, 652 F.3d 1202, 1216 (9th Cir. 2011). In *AE ex rel. Hernandez v. Cty. of Tulare*, 666 F.3d 631, 637 (9th Cir. 2012), this court held that the *Starr* standard applied to pleading policy or custom for claims against municipal entities. Although the standard for stating a claim became stricter after *Twombly* and *Iqbal*, the filings and motions of pro se inmates continue to be construed liberally. See *Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 342 (9th Cir. 2010) (as amended) (explaining that *Twombly* and *Iqbal* “did not alter the courts’ treatment of pro se filings,” and stating, “[w]hile the standard is higher

[under Iqbal], our obligation remains, where the petitioner is pro se, particularly in civil rights cases, to construe the pleadings liberally and to afford the petitioner the benefit of any doubt.

Spokane Police Manuals 2019

Discovery of any documents between conduct and reporting to city defendants, agents, or other agencies.

Plaintiff constitutional right to be secured in his person and the right to medical treatment.

Wiley - Journal of Clinical Anesthesia - 2014 - 26(1) - 102-103 - 102 - 103

filed a claim for damages per Spokane Municipal Code 04.02 in November 2019.

This is required for a person to make a claim against the City of Spokane prior to

the commencement of Filing a complaint with the Court Systems. Per Code 04.02

the City has 60 days to respond to the claim. The City Defendant defaulted and did

not respond for approximately 90 days by USPS Letter from Alternative Service

Concepts. (City Defendants Insurer not the City of Spokane) The letter notates

“Our Investigations” Meaning: Alternative Service Concepts, Not the City

Defendant. This action is directed to the City Defendants' indifference to plaintiffs' claim.

1
2 **28.** At that time City Attorney's Office (Defendant City) **had not**
3 **contact** the Internal Affairs Department of Spokane Police for investigation or
4 cease of investigations, but instead sent the claim only to their third-party self-
5 insurance company Alternative Service Concepts.
6
7

8
9 **29.** A Complaint was filed by Plaintiff in the United States District
10 Court Eastern District of Washington on February 3rd, 2020. Documents were
11 served to Defendants Officers and Defendant City on February 7th, 2020. (Case
12 was terminated without prejudice.)
13
14

15
16 **30.** Plaintiff Spoke with Lt Wohl for the Internal Affairs Division of
17 the Spokane Police Department on February 13th 2020. When asked if the City
18 Attorneys' office had contacted his office concerning the Complaint Filed with the
19 Federal Court. He Claimed no they had not. I asked if the Spokane Police
20 Department had contacted his Department and concerning this issue and he said no,
21 he had not been contacted. Plaintiff Again Spoke with Lt Cowles of the Internal
22 Affairs Division in March 2021. I again asked if the Spokane Police Department
23 or The City Attorney's office has ever contacted his Department concerning this
24 matter. He sated no to both of Plaintiff's questions. No Supervisor of the Spokane
25
26
27
28

1 Police Department has **Ever Contacted** Plaintiff, Pre or Post, the filing of a lawsuit
2 concerning issues in this complaint. Spokane Police Department Policy Manual
3 2019 Policy 300.7.2 (C). These failures by defendants leads Plaintiff to believe
4 that no use of force was ever reported to **Unknown Supervisors** of defendant
5 Officers. Or, if they were properly reported the **Unknown Supervisor that**
6 **supervisor is required to contact “person (subject) to whom which Force was**
7 **applied”**. This have never happened. Thus, leads Plaintiff to believe that either
8 defendant officers were inadequately trained in reporting Use of Force applications
9 or, **Unknown Supervisors** were derelict in their duties and/or were inadequately
10 trained in their responsibilities. This leads to **failure to supervise**. Noting, when it
11 became an **“actual fact”** that Plaintiff had significant injuries to whom was this
12 information they reported to? (discovery) In addition, Unkown Supervisors may
13 have turned a **“Blind Eye”** to the information or it was never reported to them at all.
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 Police Policy and Procedure manual 2019
21
22 209 Early Intervention Systems 209.7.1
23
24 The City Attorney’s Office **shall notify the Internal Affairs**
25 **Lieutenant** of all lawsuits filed against members concerning activities associated
26 with their employment with the Spokane Police Department. Internal Affairs shall
27 notify the appropriate Captain or equivalent command staff member. If necessary,
28

1 the Captain may meet with the City Attorney's Office for a briefing and
2 disseminate relevant information to the member's chain of command.
3

4 Policy 300 Use of Force.

5 **300.5.1 NOTIFICATION TO SUPERVISORS**

6 Supervisory notification shall be made as soon as practicable
7 following the application of force in any of the following circumstances:
8

9 **A. The application of force resulted in apparent injury to the**
10 **subject or unconsciousness (with the exception of minor marks on the wrist**
11 **consistent with being handcuffed and/ or minor marks or abrasions to portions of**
12 **the body consistent with prone handcuffing);**
13

14 **B. The subject claims an injury resulted from a use of force, even**
15 **if no injury is visible (with the exception of minor marks on the wrist consistent**
16 **with being handcuffed and/ or minor marks or abrasions to portions of the body**
17 **consistent with prone handcuffing);**
18

19 **300.7 CHAIN OF COMMAND REVIEW OF USE OF FORCE**

20 **300.7.1 SUPERVISOR REPORTING**

21 **When a supervisor becomes aware of an incident in which there**
22 **has been a reported application of force the supervisor shall complete a Use of**
23 **Force Report. Even in the event that a supervisor is unable to respond to the scene**
24 **of an incident involving the reported application of force, the supervisor is still**
25

1 required to complete a Use of Force Report. Use of Force reports are required
2 under the circumstances described in Section 300.5.1 Notification to Supervisors
3 (intentional and unintentional firearm discharges will be reported in the Firearm
4 Discharge BlueTeam incident report)

5 **300.7.2 INVESTIGATION, DOCUMENTATION AND**
6
7 **NOTIFICATION** When completing a Use of Force Report the supervisor shall
8 take the necessary steps to conduct a thorough investigation. **The supervisor**

9 **shall:** A. Respond to the scene, when possible;

10 B. Review all documentation of the incident and make every
11 reasonable effort to contact all involved officers;

12 C. Ensure identification of witnesses and other involved parties.

13 **When possible, conduct civilian interviews of those subjects, including the**

14 **subject to whom the force was applied;**

15 D. Ensure the collection of any appropriate evidence when applicable;
16 E. Ensure photographs are taken of all injuries and relevant items such
17 as dirt stains on uniforms, tears in clothing, damage to equipment, etc.;

18 F. **In the event that the supervisor believes that the incident may**
19 **give rise to potential civil litigation**, the supervisor shall notify the DSO or
20 appropriate command staff member during normal business hours;

1 G. Attach all incident reports, the CAD incident history, Conducted
2 Energy Weapon downloads, and a link to all officer-worn videos in Evidence.com;
3

4 H. Enter force options used by any officer who used reportable force.
5 List other officers present as witness officers;

6 I. Provide a brief summary of the incident in Blue Team and attach a
7 Use of Force Additional form with all other information;

8 J. Provide a brief comment stating whether the use of force was
9 within policy and any possible training issues, unless the involved officer is of an
10 equal or superior rank. If more detailed analysis is needed, include it in the Use of
11 Force Additional report;

12 K. and **forward the Use of Force Report to Internal Affairs Group**
13 in Blue Team. Spokane Police Department Spokane Police Department Policy
14 Manual Use of Force Copyright Lexipol, LLC 2019/03/14, All Rights Reserved.

15 Published with permission by Spokane Police Department Use of Force - 54
16 Internal Affairs will attach all photographs and recordings of radio traffic to the
17 report. A member of Internal Affairs will verify that all relevant materials were
18 attached to the case and forward it to the next person in the supervisor's chain of
19 command for review.

20 **300.7.3 REFERRAL TO INTERNAL AFFAIRS**
21
22
23
24

1 When there is an allegation, complaint, or a supervisor is concerned
2 that a violation may have occurred, the **supervisor shall initiate an Internal**
3 **Affairs Complaint** in Blue Team. The supervisor shall forward the Complaint and
4 the Use of Force Report though Blue Team to the Internal Affairs Group and copy
5 each member of the chain of command to include the Chief of Police in the routing.
6
7

8 300.2.1 DUTY TO INTERCEDE/ETHICAL INTERVENTION

9 Any officer present and observing another officer using force that is
10 clearly beyond that which is objectively reasonable under the circumstances shall,
11 when in a position to do so, intercede to prevent the use of unreasonable force. **An**
12 **officer who observes another employee use force that exceeds the degree of**
13 **force permitted by law should promptly report these observations to a**
14 **supervisor.**
15
16

17
18
19 **31.** The City Defendant is required to contact at minimum Internal
20 Affairs Division per 209.7.1 Spokane Police Policy and Procedure Defendant
21 City became unreasonably and deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff's Constitutional
22 Rights and deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff claim for damages (City Code .04.02
23 and Federal Complaint) for his injuries by not properly investigating Plaintiff's
24 cause of action, claims, and lack of reporting to Internal Affairs. This is obviously
25 a **"Custom and or Policy"** of administration of City Defendants and shows
26
27
28

1 indifference. City failed to train municipality officials in the proper handling of
2 claims and reporting Lawsuits to the Internal Affairs Division of the Spokane
3 Police Department. This process leads **Defendant Officers** to “know” that no
4 further investigations will be initiated by City Officials as a form of Official Policy
5 or Custom. Plaintiff did “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face. “You
6 broke my shoulder” “Take me to the hospital” Filed a Claim 04.02 and other
7 actions. To the time of this complaint no action has been taken in any capacity by
8 the defendants. (discovery)

12
13
14 **32.** Further, City Defendants failed to train Defendant Officers on
15 Policy and Procedures in Cannon One, Sections 209, and 300 for Spokane Police
16 Policy Manuals. (and others) Plaintiff would have to believe that because no
17 reports of Use of Force were reported to Internal Affairs and Internal Affairs had
18 no knowledge of an incident that Defendant Officers knew or should have known
19 that they were required to notify supervisors per Policy and Procedure 300.5.1 and
20 failed to do so.

23 (1) Therefor the training procedure must be inadequate. City
24 officials are deliberately indifferent as they are not concerned if Defendant Officers
25 followed any Policy or Procedures in the Spokane Pollice Manual or not. They
26 cannot and did not follow the Policies and Procedures themselves by not
27
28

1 contacting Internal Affairs after lawsuit was filed in Feb 2020 per Policy and
2 Procedure 209.7.1 Rather than be objective, they passed a required Claim City
3 Ordinance 04.02 to their insurance company rather than address or review the
4 claim themselves.

5 (2) The city officials must have been deliberately indifferent ““to the
6 rights of persons with whom the [local officials] come into contact””; and If the
7 Defendant Officer did not follow Policy and Procedure for one action and not
8 being disciplined, why would a reasonable person believe they would follow any
9 Policy or Procedures. The only answers are;

10 (a) failure to train and/or
11 (b) persons that came in contact with Plaintiff are indifferent to his
12 need.

13 (3) the inadequacy of the training “must
14 be shown to have ‘actually caused’ the constitutional deprivation at
15 issue.” Defendant Officers “know” that if they do not notify their Supervisor of
16 Use of Force no action will be taken. Or, Supervisor(s) did not take action and they
17 “know” that no further action will be taken. There has never been, to the best of
18 Plaintiff knowledge, a reporting to a supervisor in the Spokane Police Department
19 of any Injury or Use of Force by officers' present at the events of August 23rd 2019.
20 Defendant Officers have no fear of punishment and therefor can do anything in the
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 field they like without disciplinary action. (running amuck) If there was a reporting
2 to supervisors it would have been sent to the Internal Affairs Department of the
3 Spokane Police Department. They have no such records. Plaintiff is aware that
4 Policy and Procedures of the City Defendant and its City's Agent (Spokane County
5 Detention Center) may exist that; If a Detainee is delivered to the Spokane County
6 Detention Center with **significant injuries** the SPD must take that person to the
7 hospital themselves prior to intake. Plaintiff clearly stated to Defendant Officers
8 that his shoulder was broken and asked to be taken to the hospital. On its face,
9 Defendant Officer's would **have to** take Plaintiff's statements as true. Jeesica
10 Goodeill RN of the Spokane County Detention Center (City's Agent) is clearly
11 negligent. She is not a physician and **does not have suitable/required tools to**
12 **make a proper diagnosis of Plaintiff's actual claim.** This may be construed as
13 malpractice. Plaintiff should have been referred to SPD to transport to hospital at
14 that time. Plaintiff injuries were so obvious that a lay person would have suspected
15 he had a significant injury and need for medical treatment. (video evidence) These
16 Policies and Procedures obviously (300.6 Medical Consideration and who was the
17 **"primary handling officer"**) do not extend to the Spokane County Detention
18 Center or its employees. There appears to be a "disconnect" between Defendant
19 Citys agent and SPD in Policy and Procedures, there is not a Policy and Procedure,
20 or the Spokane County Detention Center is inadequately trained or supervised by

1 City Defendants. How important information confirming that Plaintiff “**in fact**”
2 had a significant injury was distributed is in question. What did the Spokane
3 County Detention Center do with this important information? **Plaintiff’s actual**
4 **serious injury was diagnosed and confirmed by a medical doctor.** If this
5 information goes “nowhere”, any use of force issues a quashed and buried in the
6 system. It is this official Policy or Custom. (Discovery) The Defendant Officers
7 may have “known” and exploited this fact.
8
9

10
11
12 **33.** Plaintiff was seriously injured and City Officials failed to enforce
13 Policies and Procedures and/or failed to train or failed to institute proper Policies
14 and Procedures. You can write Policies and Procedures, but if there is no
15 enforcement or proper training, they are worthless and pose a **significant risk to**
16 **public safety.** Additionally, if no **Disciplinary Actions** are taken there are no
17 Policy or Procedures. Spokane Police Manual Policy 340 Disciplinary Policy.
18 34.3.5, B,D,H,P,S, 340.3.9 Supervisor Responsibility. A & B. Section 310, 340.4
19 Investigations of Disciplinary Actions. RCW 41.12.090. To this date no
20 disciplinary actions have been taken that Plaintiff is aware of. (1) Failure of City
21 Defendants to demand enforcement of Policies and Procedure is a Direct Cause of
22 Plaintiff’s injuries and Violation of his Clearly Defined Constitutional Rights. (2)
23 Or, it is directly failure to train. Either 1, 2, or both makes the City Defendant
24
25
26
27
28

1 Indifferent to Plaintiff Injuries, medical needs, damages aused to Plaintiff, and
2 Constitutional violations in this Complaint thus culpable. (3) Failure to demand
3 Policies are followed and/or failed establish Policies and Procedures of its agents.
4 Thus, **City Defendant Failed to supervise its agents.** (Discovery issues) Plaintiff
5 is unable to located any Policies of Procedure for the Spokane County Detention
6 Center.
7
8
9
10
11

12 **34.** Defendant City then turned a “blind eye” to the violations of
13 Plaintiff’s Constitutional Rights and claims of physical injuries. Defendant City
14 know of such claims in Nov 2019 and failed to act. This demonstrates the City
15 Defendants reflections of a “conscious choice” by the City Defendants Indifference
16 to Plaintiff’s Claims. Spokane Police Internal Affairs (IA) did not hear of this
17 Claim prior to February 13th, 2020 when Plaintiff called IA. IA had no information
18 from either City of Spokane or SPD as of March of 2021. Plaintiff has letter from
19 Alternative Service Concepts dated Jan 31st 2020 that details City Defendant’s
20 indifference and offer of \$5000.00 to settle this complaint, while in the same letter,
21 being threatened Plaintiff if he took legal action. There is no mention of
22 Constitutional Violations from these sources, Spokane Police Department
23 Supervisors Reporting Use of Force or Internal Affairs starting completing an
24
25
26
27
28

1 investigation. Alternative Service Concepts is an insurance company. Not the City
2 of Spokane.
3
4

5 “To satisfy the statute, a municipality’s failure to train its employees
6 in a relevant respect must amount to ‘deliberate indifference to the rights of
7 persons with whom the [untrained employees] come into contact.’ Only then ‘can
8 such a shortcoming be properly thought of as a city ‘policy or custom’ that is
9 actionable under § 1983.’” (quoting *City of Canton*, 489 U.S. at 388). Note that
10 “[a] municipality’s culpability for a deprivation of rights is at its most tenuous
11 where a claim turns on a failure to train.” *Connick*, 563 U.S. at 61.
12
13

14
15
16 “Under this standard, a municipal defendant can be held liable
17 because of a failure to properly train its employees only if the failure reflects a
18 “conscious” choice by the government.” *Kirkpatrick v. Cty. of Washoe*, 843 F.3d
19 784, 793 (9th Cir. 2016) (en banc). The indifference of city officials may be shown
20 where, “in light of the duties assigned to specific … employees [,] the need for
21 more or different training is so obvious, and the inadequacy so likely to result in
22 the violation of constitutional rights, that the policy makers of the city can
23 reasonably be said to have been deliberately indifferent to the need.” *City of*
24
25
26 *Canton*, 489 U.S. at 390; see *Long*, 442 F.3d at 1186–87; *Johnson*, 388 F.3d at
27
28

1 686; Berry v. Baca, 379 F.3d 764, 767 (9th Cir. 2004); Lee v. City of Los Angeles,
2 250 F.3d 668, 682 (9th Cir. 2001); Oviatt v. Pearce, 954 F.2d 1470, 1477–78 (9th
3 Cir. 1992); Merritt, 875 F.2d at 770; see also Henry v. Cty. of Shasta, 137 F.3d
4 1372, 1372 (9th Cir. 1998) (order) (**amending opinion to include statement that**
5 **turning blind eye to constitutional violation can demonstrate deliberate**
6 **indifference**).
7

8
9
10 25. Spokane Police Policy and Procedure Manual 2019 States the
11 following;
12

13 Law Enforcement Code of Ethics.
14

15 Paragraph 2,
16

17 Cannon One 1.1, 1.2.
18

19 Cannon Two 2.1,2.2
20

21 Cannon Five
22

23 Cannon Six
24

25 Policy Law Enforcement Authority 100.4
26

27 Policy Law Enforcement Certification 102. 102.1
28

29 Policy Oath of Office 104.1.1
30

31 Policy Policy Manual 106, 106.4
32

33 Policy Organizational Responsibility 200. 200.2.3, 200.2.4
34

1 Policy Training 208. 208.3.2
2 Policy Early Intervention Systems 209. 209.6, **209.7.1,209.08,**
3 Policy Use of Force 300. 300.2, 300.2.1, 300.03, **300.5, 300.5.1, 300.6,**
4 **300.7, 300.7.1, 300.7.2 A-K 300.7.3,**
5 Policy Use of Force and Deadly Force Administrative Review 302.
6 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 302.3, 302.4, 302.5
7 Policy Control Techniques and Devices 308. 308.4. 308.4.4,
8 Policy Disciplinary Policy 340. 340.4
9 Policy Body Cameras 703. 703.1, 703.2, 703.3, 703.4, 703. 5. Entire
10 Policy manual maybe used for other sections in this complaint.
11
12
13
14
15
16 35. Plaintiff received a letter from Assistant Police chief dated March
17
18 5th 2020 stating that Internal Affairs has suspended investigations of Plaintiff's
19 complaint due to pending civil action pending. Plaintiff never opened a complaint.
20 Defendants had over 5 months to complete or initiate (trigger) and investigation of
21 allegations. No investigations were initiated or triggered by any Defendant in this
22 case. (to the best of his knowledge) Again, Internal Affairs states that they have
23 had no contact with the Police Department or with City Defendant concerning
24 issues in this complaint prior to Plaintiff's initial communication on February 13th
25 2020. Every municipal employee that the plaintiff came in contact with has turned
26
27
28

1 a “blind eye” to the issues in this complaint with exception of the Chief of Police
2 and the Internal Affairs Department. (whom had started an investigation on their
3 own that was terminated) This knowledge would reasonably infer that if any Use
4 of Force by Police officers are not reported to supervisors and a civil action is filed,
5 there would **never be an investigation** of the matter by the SPD or the City of
6 Spokane. Essentially grid locking it within the systems of the SPD until deadlines
7 and all responsibility or accountability has expired. Even though the City/SPD has
8 Policies and Procedures in place that appear to be sufficient at first glance, none
9 appear to have been followed.

10
11 Thus, it is implied that there is a **Blue Wall**

12
13 A deliberate and ironic statement being;

14
15 “**my hands are tied**” “**there is nothing we can do**”

16
17 But if the Plaintiff’s hands are tied and his is limited in what he can do he is
18 subjected to serious injuries, Police misconduct, his Constitutional Rights are
19 violated, and not a person he has come in contact with is concerned. (and all other
20 issues listed in this complaint)

21
22 The FBI and Police Ombudsman's offices made interesting comments
23 as well. Oddly, they were the exact same verbiage. “**This appears to be a**
24
25 **training opportunity**” Plaintiff is not interested in being injured during a

1 “Training Opportunity” Nor did he agree to be the subject of such an opportunity
2 for the SPD. But both parties have concluded that training is inadequate by
3 making this statement. (Discovery issues) Section 302.2 Review Board is to
4 evaluate. These issues and concerns will never get that far in the SPD system
5 without outside intervention, further training, or disciplinary action. **Epic failures**
6 **at every opportunity to actually follow/enforce Policies and Procedures, or**
7 **supervise at any level.** It is not the Plaintiff’s responsibility to correct this
8 misconduct. But it is the Plaintiff responsibility to file this complaint and believes,
9 his **civic duty** to protect himself and others from these types of injustice and
10 failures. To put it plainly, the Plaintiff’s life has been intruded upon. His goal “now”
11 is to have the Defendants significantly punished for their actions or failures to act.
12
13
14

15 **36.** As a direct and proximate result of one or more of the foregoing
16 unreasonable wrongful acts or omissions to act of Defendant **City**, the Plaintiff
17 sustained a violation of his rights under the Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth
18 Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, severe and permanent injury
19 to his person, pain, suffering, disability, loss of income, mental anguish,
20 humiliation, and other diverse injuries. The punishments for these actions **MUST**
21 be significant for the Defendants to effect change.
22
23
24

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant City in the amount of \$500,000 as and for compensatory damages, plus attorney fees and costs as provided in 42 U.S.C.A. § 1988. Plaintiff demands trial by jury.

COUNT FOUR

STATE LAW CLAIM FOR COMMON LAW BATTERY

Plaintiff re-alleges the allegations of Paragraphs 1-36 of this Complaint as the allegations of this Count Four, as if fully set forth.

37. At all times material, Defendant Officers were on duty as a uniformed City police officer and were unreasonably acting in the scope of their employment by Defendant City as a police officer for the city of Spokane, WA.

38. Defendant Officers acts as described herein constitute a battery under the common law of Washington. RCW 9A.36.031 (f)

39. Said acts of Defendant Officers were done without cause or provocation by Plaintiff, and with intent to cause Plaintiff injury.

40. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Officers acts as described herein, Plaintiff suffered severe and permanent injury to his person, pain, suffering, disability, loss of income, mental anguish, humiliation and other diverse injuries.

RCW 9A.36.031 (F)

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant Officers and the Defendant City, and each of them, in the amount of \$250,000 plus Plaintiff's costs of suit. Plaintiff further demands costs of medical expenses. Disciplinary action Defendant of Defendant Officers.

COUNT FIVE

**CLAIM FOR NEGLIGENCE OR GROSS NEGLIGENCE OR WILLFUL
AND WONTON MISCONDUCT**

Plaintiff re-alleges the allegations of Paragraphs 1-40 of this

Complaint as the allegations of this Count Five, as if fully set forth.

1
2 **41.** At all times material, Defendant Officers, individually and as an
3 agent, servant, and employee of Defendant City, had a duty to refrain from
4 unreasonably causing injury to Plaintiff through negligence or gross negligence or
5 willful and wanton misconduct.
6
7

8
9 **42.** In breach of their duty to refrain from causing injury to Plaintiff
10 through negligence, gross negligence or willful and wanton misconduct, Defendant
11 Officers, as an agent, servant or employee of Defendant City, were guilty of one or
12 more of the following unreasonable negligence or grossly negligent or with willful
13 and wanton acts or omissions to act, in that Defendant Officers and or its agents.
14
15

16
17 **A.** Willfully and wantonly or with negligence or gross negligence
18 violently and unreasonably without warning jerked Plaintiff by the handcuffs with
19 excessive force from his back without warning, cause or provocation, although
20 Defendant Officer knew, or should have known, that such conduct posed a
21 reasonable risk of causing serious injury to Plaintiff. This action did cause serious
22 injuries, substantial pain that persists to this day, and causes Plaintiff considerable
23 suffering and mental anguish. Plaintiff has a constant reminder through pain and
24 suffering.
25
26
27
28

1
2 **B.** Willfully and wantonly or with negligence or gross negligence
3 released and watched seatbelt restraints slap Plaintiff brutally in the face and apply
4 excessive force into Plaintiff's broken clavicle although Defendant Officers knew,
5 or should have known, that such conduct posed a reasonable risk of causing
6 additional serious injury and additional Pain and suffering to Plaintiff;
7
8

9
10 **C.** Willfully and wantonly or with negligence or gross negligence
11 further unreasonably pushed Plaintiff into vehicle by the legs with Excessive Force
12 Defendant Officers while seatbelt restraint applied additional excessive force into
13 Plaintiff's broken Clavicle damaging tendons and ligaments. Seatbelt restraint was
14 fully over extended from the opposite side of vehicle and forced into broken
15 clavicle. Defendant officers knew or should have known this would cause and did
16 cause additional injuries to Plaintiff. In video evidence Plaintiff clavicle can be
17 heard braking with a popping sound.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **D.** Willfully and wantonly or with negligence or gross negligence
2 grabbed Plaintiff by the shoulders and used excessive force to push Plaintiff into
3 vehicle in attempts to make Plaintiff it up as ordered Defendant Officers knew, or
4 should have known, that such conduct posed a reasonable risk of causing
5 additional serious injury to Plaintiff despite loud screaming and statements from
6 Plaintiff that his arm was broken. Defendant Officers could not have been
7 unaware of Plaintiff's injuries at that time. Upon understanding this after initial
8 action Defendant Officer discontinued his actions despite command to make
9 Plaintiff "sit up" knowing that this was causing additional injuries and additional
10 pain and suffering to Plaintiff.

11 RCW 9A.36.021 (f)

12 **E.** Willfully and wantonly or with negligence or gross negligence
13 struck Plaintiff in the head with car door although Defendant Officer reasonably
14 knew, or should have known, that such conduct posed an unreasonable risk of
15 causing serious injury to Plaintiff;

16 **F.** Willfully and wantonly or with negligence or gross negligence
17 although Defendant Officers knew, or should have known, that such misconduct
18 posed a reasonable risk to themselves if they failed to meet Federal, State, or local
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Standard under Color of Law by not reporting injuries. All Defendant Officer knew,
2 or should have known, that such conduct posed a reasonable risk to themselves if
3 they **reported injuries to supervisors**, filed reports properly per Policy and
4 Procedures, Properly listed injuries in police reports. Contacted or Reported
5 Injuries to Supervisors. (Omission) Failed to report injuries to Internal Affairs or
6 meet any requirements/standards of Spokane Police Department Police Policy and
7 Procedure Manual Policy 300 and others. Defendant Officers failed to report
8 injuries to any person of government agency. None of the Officers that participated
9 in injuring or witnessed the injuries to Plaintiff properly reported the injuries or
10 intervened to stop the actions of other officers after initial injury was reported by
11 Plaintiff. Defendant Officer actually ordered that plaintiff was to be subject to
12 additional injuries and plain and suffering. Some defendant Officers and
13 supervisors failed to report injuries entirely. (Omission) **One Defendant Officer**
14 **Laughed.**

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 **G.** Willfully and wantonly or with negligence or gross negligence
23 used excessive force in order to cause Plaintiff injury although Defendant **Officers**
24 knew, or should have known, that such conduct posed a reasonable risk of causing
25 serious injury to Plaintiff.

1 **H.** Willfully and wantonly or with negligence or gross negligence
2 unreasonably and recklessly placed Plaintiff in a detention cell for hours first
3 without having Plaintiff examined and treated by **a physician** for the severe
4 injuries sustained and reported by Plaintiff as a result of Defendants assaulting his
5 person leaving him unsecured in this person. Defendants Agents (medical Staff
6 RN) continued this action for hours although Defendant Officers or Defendants
7 City's Agents knew, or should have known, that such conduct posed a reasonable
8 risk of causing additional serious injury and extends for a period sufficient to cause
9 considerable pain and suffering to Plaintiff. This was also distressing to Plaintiff
10 as he did not know the extent of his injuries. If Plaintiff was not incarcerated, he
11 would have taken himself to the hospital for evaluation. Any reasonable person
12 would likely have assisted in getting Plaintiff proper medical attention. Failed to
13 put properly Policies and Procedure in place for its agents as they did not cause
14 further violation of persons Clearly Established Constitutional Rights.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

43. As a direct and proximate result of one or more of Defendant
City's Officers or Defendant City's agents' wrongful acts or omissions to act,
Plaintiff sustained severe and permanent injury to Plaintiff's person, pain, suffering,
disability, loss of income, mental anguish, humiliation and other diverse injuries.

1 **44.** Each Defendant Officer, its agents, and other officers had a
2 duty to secure Plaintiff his person and protect his Civil Right and Constitutional
3 Rights, ensure his right to proper medical treatment and/or intervene during events
4 and failed to do so.

5
6
7
8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants,
9 and each of them, in the amount of \$250,000 as and for compensatory damages,
10 punitive damages against Defendants, and each of them, in an amount sufficient to
11 deter the described wrongful conduct in the future, and Plaintiff's costs of suit.

12
13 Plaintiff demands trial by jury.

14
15
16
17
18 This cause for action is 4 counts at \$250,000 for each and \$500,000
19 for Complaint 3. Total \$1,500,000.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26 Respectfully submitted,



4 **PLAINTIFF**
5
6
7

8 **OF COUNSEL:**
9
10

11 **Aaron Bell Pro Se**
12
13

14 1724 N Altamont
15
16 Spokane WA 99207
17
18 509-218-6810
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28